DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 037 480 TE 500 613

AUTHOR Shugrue, Michael F.
TITLE The National Study of English in the Junior College.
INSTITUTION American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C.; Modern Language Association of America, New York, N.Y.; Modern Language Association of America, New York, N.Y. ERIC Clearinghouse on the Teaching of English in Higher Education.; National Council of Teachers of English, Champaign, Ill.
SPONS AGENCY Carnegie Corp. of New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE Mar 70
NOTE 18p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.00
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes, Admission (School), College Faculty, Community Colleges, Educational Improvement, English, *English Curriculum, *English Departments, English Instruction, Higher Education, *Junior Colleges, National Surveys, Questionnaires, Reports, Research, *School Surveys, Undergraduate Study

ABSTRACT

This report focuses upon the findings of a comprehensive, cooperative study of the junior college English department, its curriculum, and the role of its chairman. The study, built upon earlier research and publications and conducted over a 1-year period involving more than 1,000 junior colleges, describes: (1) background, (2) goals and procedures, (3) the 2-year college, (4) organization and curriculum of the junior college English department, (5) the junior college English instructor, and (6) the department chairman. Eight major recommendations for discussion with an explication of each are provided in view of the potential influence of the junior college on higher education in America during the 1970's. A book covering the national study is to appear early in 1971. (RL)

ED037480

The National Study of English in the Junior College

A joint project of
The Modern Language Association
The National Council of Teachers of English
and
The American Association of Junior Colleges

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Funded by
The Carnegie Corporation of New York

1968-1969

TE 500 613

The greatest American educational invention of the twentieth century is the two-year community college.

John W. Gardner
No Easy Victories

A Focus Report
Published by
The MLA ERIC Clearinghouse on the Teaching of English in Higher Education

Richard J. Worthen
Department of English
Diablo Valley College

Co-Directors
Michael F. Shugrue
English Secretary
Modern Language Association

Advisory Board

Benjamin DeMott, Amherst College
Kenneth Eble, University of Utah and Project to Improve College Teaching
Oliver Ferguson, Duke University
Robert Hogan, National Council of Teachers of English
Elma Johnson, Flint Junior College
Albert Kitzhaber, University of Oregon at Eugene
Robert Knoll, University of Nebraska at Lincoln
Elisabeth McPherson, Forest Park Community College
Audrey Roth, Miami-Dade Junior College
Derek Singer, American Association of Junior Colleges
Donald Snepp, San Francisco City College

Additional copies of this report are available from:

The ERIC Clearinghouse on the Teaching of English in Higher Education
Modern Language Association
62 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10011

and from:

The National Council of Teachers of English
508 South Sixth Street
Champaign, Illinois 61820

ED037480

I. Backgrounds of the Study

For college English departments, the 1960's was a decade of inquiry and action. The English Teacher Preparation Study (1965-1967) developed guidelines for the preparation of elementary and secondary school English teachers which suggested the need for judicious curriculum experimentation on the more than 1,100 college and university campuses preparing teachers for the schools. Don Cameron Allen's The Ph.D. in English and American Literature (1968), which provided the first authoritative profile of graduate training in English in the United States and Canada, offered recommendations for the reform of graduate education which have already influenced many of the 131 doctoral programs throughout America. Thomas Wilcox's National Survey of Undergraduate English Programs, begun in 1966, has provided a continuing flow of information about the teaching and learning of English on the more than 1,300 campuses offering the undergraduate English major.

As the two-year college has come of age in the 1960's, the English profession has inevitably paid greater attention to the junior college teacher, student, and curriculum. English in the Two-Year College (1965), the factual report compiled by Samuel Weingarten, Frederick P. Kroeger, and a joint Committee of the NCTE and the Conference on College Composition and Communication, led in turn to the important Tempe Conference of February, 1965, the first national conference at which junior college English instructors discussed professional issues with their colleagues from the universities. These discussions and the recommendations of the conference, published in Research and the Development of English Programs in the Junior College (1965), edited by Jerome Archer and Wilfred A. Ferrell, prompted the establishment of six Regional Conferences on English in the Two-Year College under the auspices of the Conference on College Composition and Communication in 1966.

The American Association of Junior Colleges, too, had demonstrated its concern for excellence in junior college teaching by sponsoring Roger Garrison's important Junior College Faculty: Issues and Problems (1967), based on discussions with nearly 700 two-year college faculty members, and his introduction to Teaching in a Junior College: A Brief Professional Orientation (1968).

In 1967 the MLA, NCTE, and AAJC drew up plans for a comprehensive, cooperative study of the preparation of junior college English instructors which would build upon available research and publications and upon a growing professional recognition of the importance of English in the two-year college. The study would describe the junior college English department, its curriculums, and the role of its chairman, and would outline the responsibility of graduate departments of English to participate in the pre- and in-service training of junior college English instructors. A generous grant of $58,700.00 from the Carnegie Corporation of New York enabled the associations to begin the year-long National Study of English in the Junior College in September, 1968, under the co-direction of Richard J. Worthen and Michael F. Shugrue.

II. Goals and Procedures

The thirteen-member advisory committee which met in New York City in September, 1968, defined three goals for the study and outlined nine procedures for gathering information

and opinion. The study would attempt 1) to involve every junior college English instructor in the United States in the national dialogue about the teaching and learning of English; 2) to provide an authoritative profile of the junior college English instructor and of the department in which he teaches; and 3) to make recommendations to improve the pre- and in-service preparation of junior college English instructors. The Board agreed, moreover, to use "junior college" as a generic term for the wide variety of two-year public and private junior and community colleges in the United States.

Nine procedures were outlined for gathering the information upon which the final report of the study could be based and for developing recommendations to junior colleges, to the graduate schools preparing junior college English instructors, to the professional associations, and to agencies which could support projects for further research.

In December, 1968, a carefully designed four-page questionnaire was mailed to the 8,700 two-year college English instructors teaching in 993 junior and community college English departments identified by the MLA with the help of AAJC and NCTE. More than 2,700 instructors completed and returned the forty-six question instrument in the succeeding three months. During the same period, over 400 chairmen of departments of English or of divisions offering English courses completed an eight-page questionnaire containing ninety-six questions about institutional policies on such matters as tenure and load, the organization of the English department, course offerings, and the authority of the chairman. These chairmen also identified outstanding teachers in their departments who might be invited to regional conferences and asked to offer advice during the course of the study.

An authoritative profile of the English instructor, chairman, department, and curriculum, however, depended upon an extremely high response from the sample of 263 junior colleges prepared with the assistance of Dr. Dorothy Knoell of the American Association of Junior Colleges. Intensive efforts to secure responses from chairmen and instructors in 79 institutions along the Atlantic Seaboard, 71 in the Midwest, 57 from the Rocky Mountain and Far Western area, and 56 from the South and Southwest produced the 91.6% response on which our profile is based. The list of participating institutions will be appended to the book-length report of the study to be published early in 1971.

Four other questionnaires provided valuable additional data. One hundred and twenty-seven junior college presidents agreed that a shortage of qualified junior college English instructors was apparent and offered to cooperate with the graduate schools and with the professional associations to develop pre- and in-service programs to prepare English instructors for the special needs of the junior colleges. The presidents, in particular, called for "generalists" who know how to teach "communications skills" rather than for research-oriented literary specialists.

Fifty-three of the fifty-eight graduate departments of English which were offering or participating in the offering of special degree programs or courses designed for the preparation of junior and community college teachers in 1968-1969 provided detailed descriptions of their programs and revealed drastic differences in their commitment to them. Twenty other departments outlined their plans for the introduction of such programs in 1969 and 1970.

In addition, 743 students who had been enrolled in freshman English classes in nine representative junior colleges, including 58 "dropouts," completed a fourteen-question evaluation of their work in English.

Finally, more than 200 instructors who had been identified by their chairmen as successful junior college English teachers commented at length upon their educational backgrounds, the kinds of training needed by junior college English instructors, the goals of a successful junior college English program, and the direction of junior college English in the 1970's. These thoughtful responses helped the staff interpret the mass of statistical data collected during the year.

From completed questionnaires and other documents the staff identified major problems facing the two-year college English department and drafted preliminary recommendations for discussion at ten regional conferences and at a national invitational workshop held in San Francisco in April, 1969. More than 300 teachers and administrators from two- and four-year colleges and universities interpreted data, clarified issues, debated proposed recommendations, and offered advice during the year of the study.

Using the resources of the Association of Departments of English and the MLA ERIC Clearinghouse on the Teaching of English in Higher Education, the staff also collected pertinent documents on the history of the junior college, innovative junior college English programs, and model in-service programs for junior college English instructors.

The following pages present major findings of the study and recommendations for discussion by departments of English and by individual members of the profession.

III. The Two-Year College

Before looking at the English instructor and the courses which he teaches in today's junior college, one must briefly examine the junior college as an educational phenomenon. Clyde E. Blocker, Robert H. Plummer, and Richard C. Richardson, Jr. correctly observe in The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1965) that "The two-year college, despite a history of more than half a century, has only within the last ten years emerged as a significant contributor to the educational process" (p. 2). Such private two-year colleges as Monticello College (1835) and Susquehanna University (1858) had been established in the nineteenth century, but only eight junior colleges enrolling about 100 students were in existence as late as 1900. Even though men like William Rainey Harper of the University of Chicago advocated throughout the 1890's the establishment of lower colleges separated from the university campuses, the growth of the junior college movement in the early twentieth century was extremely slow. From the beginning, however, English, or "Combination English" as the junior college established as a segment of the secondary school system in Joliet, Illinois, called it, was an essential part of the junior college curriculum. Typically, the introductory English course was modeled closely on that offered in neighboring four-year institutions.

Thanks to enlightened legislation in such states as California as early as 1907, seventy junior colleges had opened by 1921, 258 by 1938, 365 by 1955, and 403 by 1962. In the 1960's, however, the junior college movement has shown its most dramatic growth. The 1969 PMLA Directory lists 1,013 two-year colleges enrolling more than 1,900,000 students. One can easily accept Joseph Cosand's prediction in Campus 1980 (New York: Delacorte, 1968) that "the community college or technical institute will, by 1980, have accepted virtually the entire responsibility for providing the first two years of college work" (p. 139) for the nearly 12,000,000 students who will then be enrolled in higher education.

Our study confirms the youth and vigor of these institutions and of their faculties.

Fully 23% of the colleges are in fact less than five years old. Nearly half (49%) have already established either a communications center or an instructional materials center on campus. These predominantly public (90%), accredited (81%), co-educational (95%) institutions are, perhaps surprisingly, still relatively small. In the fall of 1969, for example, two-thirds of the colleges had fewer than 2,500 daytime students and 41% enrolled fewer than 1,000. Nearly half (48%) reported an evening enrollment of under 1,000 students. Sixty-five percent of these growing institutions currently operate on a two-semester basis, 28% on a four-quarter schedule.

Although 86% of the institutions call themselves open-door colleges, there is obviously some confusion about the meaning of the term. A surprising 85% charge at least minimal tuition and 22% require that students qualify for admission by examination. Correlations of our data indicate, in fact, that only 72% of all junior colleges consider themselves open-door and do not require an entrance examination for admission.

The two-year college already offers a wide range of faculty benefits. While 69% have a fixed salary schedule which ranks personnel solely on the basis of teaching experience and academic training, 25% have introduced merit pay increases for selected instructors. Tenure is offered by 64% of the colleges and academic rank by 44% (the latter a phenomenon more than twice as popular among institutions in the Northeast as in any other part of the United States). Yet only 16% of all colleges grant both tenure and the opportunity to earn merit pay. A formal policy on sabbatical leave now exists on 59% of all junior college campuses. English department chairmen, one notes, generally favor tenure (79%), merit pay (53%), and academic rank (50%) more than their instructors do (75%, 34%, and 48%). Chairmen are also somewhat more satisfied (53%) with the criteria applied for tenure and promotion within the college than are junior college English teachers (47%).

IV. The Junior College English Department: Organization and Curriculum

In size, organization, and course offerings, English departments in the junior college show rich diversity and marked regional differences. Thomas Wilcox has noted that the English teacher in a four-year college finds his home in an "English department" on 81% of all campuses, but for the junior college instructor many titles may designate the department or division within which he works: English (44%); Humanities (25%); Communications (9%); Language, Language Arts, and Language and Literature (13%); General Studies (4%); or one of more than twenty other administrative titles.

Like its counterpart in the four-year college, the junior college English department has the largest number of full time instructors on 72% of all campuses. Yet most departments are still quite small; in 1969 68% had fewer than ten full time faculty members and nearly all (91%) had fewer than twenty. The typical department, in fact, consisted of between five and nine full time faculty members (38%) and fewer than four part-time instructors (52%). But these departments expect to grow quickly. By the fall of 1970, for example, only 71% of the departments expect to employ fewer than twenty full time faculty and only 45% plan for fewer than ten full time staff members. Despite their rapid growth, however, only 10% yet employ paraprofessionals as lay readers, student associates, and uncertified helpers on a regular basis. Although 40% of all English departments hired only one or two new instructors in 1969, 39% received at least twenty formal applications for teaching positions and 14%, most of them located in major urban centers, received more than 100.

Tests are administered by 67% of all departments to decide whether or not a student

will be admitted to the beginning transfer freshman composition course; indeed, 36% admit to some form of tracking, although often flexibly administered. Even those 21% of departments which offer with other departments interdisciplinary general education or humanities courses devote their principal efforts to the teaching of four basic curriculum sequences: college transfer composition, non-transfer composition, sub-freshman courses or workshops for the development of fluency and mastery of skills, and literature. Over half of all departments (59%) devote more than 50% of their energies to teaching the college transfer composition course. Most typically, 39% claim that 50-65% of their effort is directed to the transfer course. It is a rare junior college English department indeed (11%) which is not devoting at least a quarter of its teaching time to the transfer course.

Eighty percent of these classes are taught in sections of under thirty and 40% in classes of fewer than twenty-five students. Departments indicate that their courses in freshman composition emphasize not only the development of writing and speaking skills but principles of literary criticism and communication theory. Modern linguistic concepts and semantics play only a minor role in the curriculum.

While 16% of the departments do not offer a course labelled non-transfer composition, 39% devote up to a third of their time to these courses. A few departments (13%) are currently devoting more. It is surprising to learn that 14% of junior college departments do not offer sub-freshman courses or workshops for the development of fluency and mastery of skills. Only 54%, in fact, are devoting as much as 30% of departmental time to this important task. As one might expect, however, these special classes and workshops usually have smaller class sections than any of the other standard departmental offerings; nearly 30% admit fewer than twenty students to a section and fully 59% have less than twenty-five.

Most departments (86%) devote less than half their instructional time to literature courses, but more than half (52%) devote between a quarter and a third of departmental time to the teaching of literature in a variety of courses. Instructors regularly meet larger numbers of students in these classes than in their composition courses; 59% of all literature courses are taught in sections of thirty or more students. Fortunately, fewer than 3% grow beyond forty.

Obviously junior college departments vary greatly in the courses which they offer and in the student populations which they serve. If one generalizes about the English curriculum, however, he can observe that the junior college department currently concentrates about half of its teaching time on the college transfer composition course and divides the major portion of the remainder of its time among courses in literature, non-transfer composition and skills acquisition at the sub-freshman level. This heavy departmental emphasis on transfer composition may be explained, in part, by the assignment of specially qualified instructors to collegiate programs in such areas as remedial reading (64%). It also reflects a widespread lack of clarity about the distinctions between transfer and non-transfer composition courses and about the goals of a freshman English program. In a year's time, however, the typical department may offer not only a literary survey (99%), at least one genre course (53%), and a course in modern literature (32%), but such intriguing courses as film study, advanced composition, English as a second language, creative writing, theater, mass media, and black literature. In addtion, nearly a quarter (22%) are currently allowing students to undertake independent study.

Many of these relatively new departments have not yet established clearly-defined departmental procedures for making decisions about curriculum and other matters affecting faculty and students. Only 61%, for example, hold regularly-scheduled meetings of the faculty, most often on a monthly basis (36%). Nearly a third (32%) of all junior college departments operate without standing committees, but committees on curriculum (29%),

courses (12%), evaluation (11%), textbooks (8%), advisory to the chairman (7%), recruiting, teaching load, and library (4%) have begun to help some of these growing departments operate more efficiently and more democratically. Since most junior college departments are still small, major departmental decisions can usually be made by the department acting as a whole (68%). In a small number of departments, however, even the most important decisions are reached by the chairman and his committees (17%) or by the chairman acting alone (8%).

The responsibility for the selection and adoption of textbooks in courses with multiple sections rests with the entire department in about half of all colleges (51%), or with a committee of those teaching the course (40%). Some departments allow instructors to select texts for certain courses (19%) or to exercise considerable latitude in choosing texts from a departmental list. A common syllabus is the most frequently used device to achieve some degree of uniformity in courses with multiple sections (59%). Chairmen believe that some degree of uniformity is desirable (43%), especially in beginning courses, but 26% strongly urge flexibility in any system adopted by the department.

The college administration plays an important, sometimes too paternal, role in many departmental matters. Although the department or its chairman (17%) initiates the recruitment of new English instructors on 40% of all campuses and works cooperatively with the central administration on 32% of the remainder, the administration initiates such action alone 19% of the time. Even the selection of new members of the English staff (16%), and more often the appointment (25%) and the establishment of their rank and salary (44%) remains too frequently the primary responsibility of the central administration rather than of the English department. Setting teaching loads, establishing class size, and granting released time are other areas in which the administration initiates action before communicating with the department in at least a quarter of junior colleges. In a large number of colleges, however, the department has complete autonomy in certain areas: setting modes of instruction (55%) and making course revisions (44%), for example. Moreover, it often plays the major role in determining whether or not to add or to eliminate courses (54%) and programs (47%). It is still all too common, however, for faculty members to be excluded from participating directly in making decisions affecting the staffing and curriculum of the English department.

Although instructors clearly indicated the need for on-campus workshops and seminars to help them keep abreast of new developments in their field, only 18% of junior college departments offer in-service programs for faculty which regularly draw upon the resources of the university communities that exist within fifty miles of 76% of all two-year college campuses. Only 4% of the small number of departments which recruit and employ teaching aides and assistants (10%) have set up special seminars and workshops to upgrade the professional competence of their paraprofessionals in cooperation with university specialists in such fields as English and guidance. The junior college English faculty, no matter how well qualified to design and conduct its own in-service programs, has generally failed to make good use of the resources of nearby research institutions. The 127 college presidents participating in this study overwhelmingly called for the development of cooperatively planned in-service programs which would regularly bring to the junior college campus appropriate specialists from the universities and from the community.

V. The Junior College English Instructor

The junior college English instructor was the primary focus of this study. Information

about him and about his beliefs came not only from the controlled sample of instructors and chairmen in 263 colleges, but from nearly 3,000 additional completed questionnaires and thoughtful letters. One fact emerges clearly: in these new institutions a young, innovative faculty is at work. Fully 26% of all junior college English instructors are under thirty years of age; 62% are younger than forty. Women comprise 44% of the junior college English faculty, twice the current percentage in American four-year college departments. The MA or MAT has been earned by 84% of these instructors, but only 6% hold the Ph.D. or Ed.D., almost the same percentage teaching with the AB (4%). Twenty-three percent are in their first year in their present institutions and 76% have been in their present positions fewer than five years. Only 14% of those now teaching in a junior college graduated from one themselves, but 15% had taught in another junior college before coming to their present positions and, therefore, bring to their teaching an understanding of the unique qualities of the two-year college. While 16% of all instructors had served as departmental chairmen in secondary schools immediately before coming to junior college teaching, most of the faculty (47%) had taught English (66%) in a secondary school (41%) for no more than two years (40%).

In light of their criticisms of the irrelevancy of much of current graduate study in English, it is perhaps surprising to learn that 49% have taken a course officially listed as a graduate course since June, 1967. Another 14% have taken course work relevant to their work which is not for graduate credit and a healthy 71% indicate that they have since June, 1967 participated in at least one college-sponsored seminar, workshop, or professional meeting. Almost two-thirds of these instructors (64%) feel confident that they are able to take part in the national dialogue that influences trends and policies in junior college English. Although a surprising number fail to specify the nature and extent of their participation, instructors are clearly more likely to read professional publications (57%) and to attend regional meetings (54%) than to attend national professional meetings (25%). The study does reveal that instructors are affiliating themselves in ever greater numbers with professional societies: 76% now belong to at least one professional organization and 53% belong to two or more. Instructors have joined such national organizations as NCTE (40%), the American Association of University Professors (24%), and CCCC (23%) more frequently than the National Educational Association (18%), MLA (17%), or College English Association (12%). But they also hold membership in such growing regional associations as the six NCTE-CCCC Regional Conferences on English in the Two-Year College (24%) and in state affiliates to the NEA (22%). Few junior college English instructors have yet joined any of the Regional MLA's (5%), the American Federation of Teachers (12%), or the National Faculty Association (3%), but their numbers, too, can be expected to increase.

Teaching loads vary widely in these colleges. Chairmen report that 57% of all English faculty members average a teaching load of 13-15 hours per week, 32% teach 9-12 hours, 6% teach 16 hours or more, and fewer than 1% meet classes less than 9 hours per week.

Asked independently how many hours per week they were meeting classes in the fall and winter of 1968-1969, instructors verified a standard weekly teaching load in excess of twelve hours (51%). One can safely assume that despite a noticeable movement toward the twelve-hour load on many campuses, junior college English departments will not soon reach the nine-hour weekly teaching load proposed by the National Junior College Committee of CCCC in April, 1968.

In the fall of 1968, 75% of all instructors were teaching at least one college transfer composition course; 10% taught nothing else. Class size and student load varied widely for these instructors and for the 18% teaching at least one non-transfer or sub-freshman

composition course. That 21% faced more than 100 composition students weekly and 65% more than 60 students proves that the National Committee's recommended composition load of 50 students has not yet been widely accepted.

Although 54% of the faculty taught at least one section of a literature course, few instructors (4%) did so exclusively. A combination of transfer composition and literature was, in fact, the most common program (35%). No more than 8% of the faculty reported any other single combination of courses.

More than heavy teaching loads and large classes, however, keep the junior college English instructor from having sufficient time for student conferences and for his own professional growth. Only 47% of departments provide reduced teaching loads for instructors who are heavily burdened with large classes and other assignments. Although 54% regularly assign staff members to such extra-curricular activities as directing plays, conducting speech contests, and advising the student newspaper, yearbook, or literary magazine and 69% permit instructors to volunteer for these activities, only 31% offer these engaged teachers a reduced teaching load and only 24% offer additional, compensatory salary.

The rapid growth of evening division programs poses additional problems. While 39% of departments assign full time instructors to the night program as part of their regular teaching loads, 47% permit instructors to teach in the evening division in order to supplement their regular salaries by teaching more than the normal departmental load. Not surprisingly, instructors take advantage of this opportunity in 51% of departments. Indeed, 13% of departments report that more than half of their faculty was so engaged in the fall of 1968.

These busy schedules certainly help to account for the fact that instructors spend, on the average, fewer than five hours a week conferring with students outside of class periods (53%). Twenty-two percent confer between six and ten hours and 21% more than ten.

Both chairmen and instructors recognize that effective teaching and meeting the needs of students of varying backgrounds and abilitites are of primary importance in the junior college.

An indication of the interest in effective teaching shown by junior college English department chairmen is their identification of seven "extremely important" qualifications for potential new faculty members: 1) a concern for the needs of students (90%), 2) the promise of ability to stimulate learning (58%), 3) a general knowledge of human communication (43%), 4) recommendation as a successful teacher (39%), 5) an awareness of the concept of the open-door community college (36%), 6) a concern for the integrity of the subject matter of English (34%), and 7) a general knowledge of English and American literature (30%). Conspicuously absent from the characteristics noted as important are scholarly publication and academic specialization.

Instructors recognize, too, that satisfactory teaching is the primary criterion for decisions about tenure and promotion far more than such other typical considerations as length of service (28%), professional activity (2%), and publication (1%).

Instructors provided significant information about the components which should be covered in pre- and in-service programs to prepare junior college English teachers. The response to question six deserves full quotation:

From your knowledge of the teachers and teaching in your department which of the following fifteen items are most needed to improve instruction?
Mark five in order of importance.

Item	Percentage of responses listing item among five most needed	Percentage of responses ranking item first
Techniques in teaching composition	71	34
Variety in teaching techniques	46	4
Defining and measuring relevant course objectives	43	7
Breadth in related academic subjects such as history, sociology, political science, philosophy	41	8
Knowledge of how to teach reading as a basic skill (as contrasted to teaching critical reading or understanding literature)	37	7
Characteristics of the junior college student	31	6
Psychology of interpersonal relations	28	6
Knowledge of psychological learning theory	26	3
Courses in literature	25	5
Curriculum development and articulation	25	3
Techniques of conferring with students	20	1
Mastery of grammatical skills	19	2
Philosophy of the junior college	18	3
Research techniques for instructional purposes	15	1
Platform skills	9	0

Even a casual study of these responses indicates the great importance which junior college English teachers place upon learning more about the teaching of composition.

These instructors also comment informatively on the forces which shape English in the junior college and on the content of the English courses which they teach. Many (38%) still consider their own college administrators or the English departments of transfer institutions (15%) to have a more powerful influence on trends and policies in junior college English than their own departments (12%). Neither the junior college administrative establishment (5%) nor the college English establishment (9%) carries as much weight.

A third (32%) of junior college English teachers believe that the standard transfer course in freshman composition should be modeled on the basic composition course in the university or four-year college; 22% consider the goals of their courses to be quite compatible with those on the four-year campuses. To maintain comparable standards, 28% of junior college instructors expect their transfer course to be an upper-track offering for which sub-freshman courses and workshops are preparatory. The majority of instructors (60%), however, sees the course not as a parallel to that offered in a four-year college, but as the most effective course which the staff can design to meet student needs, departmental standards, and the general educational commitments of their institutions. A growing percentage of instructors wants the transfer course to be administered with flexible and non-punitive withdrawal policies (35%) and to be open to any student who elects to take it (29%).

Although little is known about the process of composing and few junior colleges have

undertaken research in this important area of the curriculum, only 5% of junior college English instructors believe that writing courses cannot be taught successfully and should therefore not be taught as such. Most teachers (78%), recognizing that it is an important means of developing and exploring awareness for all students in English, want writing to be a continuing part of every English class, practiced in some manner at most meetings (68%). Few (12%) would limit students to expository writing in the freshman composition and remedial classes. To serve a growing student interest in writing as a means of self discovery as well as a way of communicating ideas effectively, departments often supplement their introductory composition courses with work in technical writing (36%), advanced composition (29%), creative writing (12%), and journalism (8%).

Even in classes devoted solely to the study of literature, instructors do not give primary emphasis to teaching literary genres (23%), historical movements and periods (26%), or even contemporary works which will readily engage the less sophisticated student (42%). They see literature, rather, as a powerful instrument for developing awareness for all students (88%), one which should be an integral part of all English classes, including those labelled remedial or sub-freshman (58%). Whether in the literary selections introduced into the basic composition courses, the survey courses listed by 99% of all departments, the genre courses taught in 54%, the classes in modern literature common to 33%, or the special classes in humanities and in black literature being introduced into the junior college curriculum, instructors claim as their goal the development of the student's literary imagination rather than the accumulation of any body of knowledge about a group of literary works. One fervently hopes that the practice of junior college teachers in the classroom matches the lofty idealism of their convictions.

The majority of instructors (59%) recognizes that literature, when well taught in junior college classes, inevitably involves at least some teaching of reading; 36% agree that all English teachers have some responsibility to improve the reading skills of students in all English classes. But the variety and extent of reading problems which students bring to the junior college lead 58% of instructors to favor the teaching of reading as a separate skills course open to all students and 36% to support the introduction of rapid reading courses to prepare students for advanced college work. Forty-five percent of the faculty want these courses staffed by qualified reading specialists and 58% believe that certain students will develop reading speed and comprehension later only if they are introduced to the fundamentals of word attack practice, phonics, vocabulary study, and syllabification first. Three quarters (76%) of those teaching sub-freshman courses identify this latter need.

The uncertainty about the department's role in the teaching of reading extends to the teaching of speech as well. Speech should be taught informally by all teachers of English according to 41% of the faculty and speech concepts and skills should be systematically but informally developed in the basic freshman composition course, say 27%. Yet 53% of instructors believe that speech concepts and skills are sufficiently specialized and important to be taught separately from the regular English program; 28% want speech taught as a separate skill in classes for poor speakers. During 1968-1969, only 6% of all departments of English were offering courses in speech and oral communication at least once each term.

Curriculum reform and experimentation with innovative classroom techniques should be hallmarks of the junior college English department. The department does have the opportunity to use the communications center or instructional materials center which exists on 49% of campuses. The study indicates, however, that 55% of instructors have had no first-hand experience with team teaching and 28% have not even worked with

programmed material. Even though 68% believe that group discussion is essential to the sound teaching of literature and writing and 53% recognize it as an important means of securing the engagement of the timid and excluded student, 37% admit that discussion does not receive sufficient attention in their own English departments and 19% suspect that such discussion too often results in wasted time and a failure to cover subject matter. Only 33% believe that team teaching enables instructors to become better teacher-scholars and only 25% that it results in more attention to the needs of the individual student; 12% dismiss team teaching as "a good example of high school approaches to the college level." Independent study has appeared on only 22% of all campuses. While 58% of instructors will grant that programmed material can have its place in the English program if properly employed and 40% admit that it can help to meet individual needs efficiently, 14% consider it still very much an unknown quantity. These sample responses, which suggest a greater faculty conservatism about even well-established classroom techniques than one would have expected, support John E. Roueche and John R. Boggs's conclusion in Junior College Institutional Research (AAJC, 1968) that it "appears that junior colleges (like other educational institutions) do not profit from the research of others " (p. 51).

VI. The Department Chairman

The powers and responsibilities of the chairman have not been carefully defined in most junior college English departments. Usually appointed by the college administration (72%) rather than elected by his faculty (16%), the chairman must serve both as the educational and administrative leader of his department, working in cooperation and consultation with his faculty, and as the principal liaison officer between the faculty and the college administration. Ordinarily called chairman (74%), he may also be known as head (10%), coordinator (2%), director (1%), or even lead instructor. He may hold office for an indefinite term (40%), on a permanent basis (5%), or on a term appointment of one (21%), two(16%), or three years (8%), with a 67% possibility of renewal. The position rarely rotates among members of the faculty (1%).

The chairman usually has at least part-time secretarial help (73%), but he seldom has the aid of an associate or assistant chairman (7%). Two-thirds (67%) of those who act as chairman are given a reduced teaching load and 45% receive a supplementary salary stipend, but only 34% receive both. Unfortunately, 15% receive neither a stipend for their service nor even secretarial assistance during their tenure in office.

Chairmen indicate that they rarely (8%) make major departmental decisions alone. More frequently, the chairman works through his committees (17%) or through the department as a whole (68%). But crucial decisions on tenure (18%), promotion (17%), faculty appointments (25%), teaching loads (29%), and class size (22%) are still too often initiated outside the department. The junior college English department will flourish in the 1970's as it receives and uses wisely through its chairman the opportunity to exercise a more important role in making decisions which effect the teaching and learning of English in the two-year college.

VII. The Junior College Student

While the study did not sample student opinion widely, it asked 743 junior college students who had taken an introductory English course in one of nine colleges to comment upon their work in English. Questionnaires were returned by 685 sophomores

enrolled in transfer programs, terminal vocational programs, technical-mechanical programs, and service programs such as nursing and by 58 students who had left college before completing a full year of credit.

Of those who had left school, 61% had attended classes for at least one semester and 65% had completed an English course. These students, more frequently coming from homes in which neither parent had earned a high school diploma (24%) than their fellow students who were still enrolled (15%), cited personal reasons such as marriage, illness, and the need to work as the major causes for dropping out of college. Only two students claimed that a failure to do satisfactory work in English had contributed to their decision to leave. Half (49%) of the students in this group reported that their junior college English instructors had learned their strengths and interests in English and, regardless of the grades which students had earned in the course, 45% of the students felt that their work in English had had a positive effect upon their lives and thinking.

Of those still enrolled in college, 58% noted that their teachers had demonstrated a genuine interest in learning about their students and 55% considered their work in English to have had a positive effect on their later education. Those interested in the humanities, social sciences, and service professions described their work in composition (47%) and in literature (71%) as both important and interesting. Students more interested in science, mathematics, and technology found composition (32%) and literature (42%) less interesting and important, but few (10%) dismissed their work in composition as unimportant.

VIII. Conclusion

This brief report on the National Study of English in the Junior College can only suggest the wealth of valuable information and opinion about English in the two-year college which Richard J. Worthen's thoughtful book will present to the profession early in 1971. Statistics can never reflect adequately the excellence of individual programs, departments, chairmen, and junior college English instructors. They can offer an overview of the state of junior college English in the United States today. And they can help to explain why the recommendations which follow deserve the careful study of every member of the English profession, of junior college administrators, and of the interested general public.

Michael F. Shugrue
March 1970

THE NATIONAL STUDY OF ENGLISH IN THE JUNIOR COLLEGE

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DISCUSSION

The rapid growth of the junior and community college, the shortage of qualified two-year college English instructors, and the unusual opportunities afforded to these emerging institutions to influence higher education in the 1970's lead to the following eight recommendations:

I. The two-year college English department must engage in a continuous examination of its goals.

II. The two-year college English program must meet the needs of students from a wide variety of educational, social, economic, and cultural backgrounds.

III. The two-year college English instructor must play an active role in determining the educational goals of his institution as well as of the English program within that institution.

IV. The two-year college English instructor must continue his professional growth with the assistance and encouragement of his college.

V. The two-year college English department chairman must have the authority to serve as the educational leader and spokesman for his faculty, consulting with them in planning and carrying out the work of his department.

VI. The two-year college English department must develop effective ways to use teaching aides and assistants.

VII. Graduate departments of English, as part of their commitment to excellence in teaching, must initiate and support substantive and flexible programs which will prepare qualified two-year college English instructors.

VIII. Public, private, and institutional funds must provide support for further research into the teaching and learning of English in the two-year college and for the establishment of pre- and in-service programs to prepare qualified two-year English instructors.

EXPLICATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS

I. Because the two-year college English department can provide educational opportunities for growing numbers of students in the 1970's by developing literacy and an awareness of one's self and one's culture, it must design flexible programs which provide all students with the humane experience which defines the field of English. Such programs should:

a. Lead the student to an awareness of his intellectual and spiritual gifts and to an understanding of similar gifts in others;
b. Provide counseling which assists the student to recognize his needs and capacities and helps him to choose courses appropriate to them;
c. Use only those diagnostic tests which the department has devised or carefully checked; these standardized tests should be used exclusively for counseling, not in tracking;
d. Allow the student to choose freely from among the department courses, to change courses, and to withdraw from courses without penalty until the end of the term;
e. Base classroom standards on the differing aims of individual courses rather than on conventional ideas of correctness not appropriate to all courses.
f. Provide for student participation in shaping departmental offerings.

II. Because the two-year college English department serves students of varying interests, abilities, backgrounds, and ages, it must develop flexible programs. It must define broad, humane ends. The dialect the student speaks, the rate at which he reads, the variations with which he spells and punctuates should be less important than the ideas he encounters and the experience he has of thinking and expressing himself. Programs should:

a. Include a wide variety of courses honestly and accurately described;
b. Make available assistance in reading, spelling, punctuation, and usage on an elective, non-punitive basis:
c. Offer courses whose credits are transferable to four-year institutions.

III. In order to function effectively in the junior college, with departmental and institutional support, the English instructor must:

a. Help to develop courses, select textbooks, study standards, and establish testing procedures within the English department;
b. Strive to improve teaching conditions; he will be concerned with such matters as academic freedom, work load, professional leave, and tenure;
c. Participate in the governance of the college as a whole;
d. Engage students in a continuing discussion about the aims of English instruction in the two-year college.

IV. Because the two-year college English instructor must deal with a growing, heterogeneous student body, he must receive support to:

a. Undertake research into the teaching and learning of English in the two-year college;
b. Involve students, community representatives, faculty members from transfer institutions and graduate departments, and his own colleagues on campus in a continuing discussion of English in the two-year college;
c. Participate in the design, implementation, and evaluation of programs for the preparation of qualified two-year college English instructors;
d. Participate in the design, implementation, and evaluation of in-service programs on two-year college campuses;
e. Participate in the national discussion of the aims and methods of English instruction in higher education by joining professional associations and attending regional and national meetings.

V. Because an effective chairman is crucial to the continuing vitality of the two-year college English department, he must:

a. Exercise major responsibilities for budget, appointments, evaluation, and curriculum design after full consultation with his faculty or their elected representatives;
b. Protect the academic freedom of the faculty;
c. Develop and conduct in-service programs in consultation with his faculty which provide for the continuing intellectual and professional growth of his faculty, support the participation of faculty members in professional activities, establish experimental classrooms, and work with transfer and graduate institutions preparing junior and community college English instructors;
d. Help to develop an intellectual community on campus by bringing writers and scholars for visits of varying lengths, by establishing inter-departmental courses and seminars, and by encouraging rapport between faculty and students;
e. Serve for a stated and renewable term with the consent of his faculty.

VI. In order to attract students and others into the teaching profession, to involve representatives of the community in the life of the school, to serve student needs more adequately, and to provide instructors with released time for professional growth, the two-year college English department should:

a. Train and use teaching aides and associates; these may be recruited from the total community including persons both formally and informally educated, from junior college graduates continuing their education elsewhere, and from the current student body;
b. Work to encourage a greater emphasis on rational qualifications for teaching in the junior college instead of standardized certification requirements;
c. Provide opportunities for the career advancement of paraprofessionals, including in-service training.

VII. Because graduate departments of English must take the primary responsibility for preparing qualified instructors for two-year college departments, they should:

a. Offer formal instruction for potential two-year college instructors in at least the following:

1. Writing beyond ordinary freshman rhetoric in addition to literary criticism. The potential instructor needs to learn how writing can clarify his experience of himself and his world. To make his teaching of writing effective he needs also a sympathetic understanding of the complexity of the writing process;
2. The nature and variety of language, with special attention to how language is acquired and how languages including dialects change;
3. Literary criticism and history;
4. The relationship between reading facility and literary appreciation;
5. Allied disciplines so that he may gain an awareness of the changing nature of modern society, a sympathy for cultures different from his own, and a sensitivity to the predicament of individuals faced with revolutionary changes;

b. Develop and coordinate with other departments within the university special graduate programs for prospective two-year college English instructors;
c. Help two-year colleges to plan and conduct programs;
d. Develop exchange programs with two-year college English departments;
e. Provide internships for teacher candidates on two-year college campuses.

VIII. Two-year college English departments, graduate departments of English, and the professional associations must receive financial and professional support to:

a. Establish graduate programs which will adequately prepare qualified two-year college English instructors;
b. Design and carry out in-service programs on two-year college campuses;
c. Develop programs for the effective use of paraprofessionals in two-year college English departments;
d. Design innovative two-year college English programs;
e. Establish programs which will involve the community in the life of the two-year college;
f. Provide continuing cooperation between two- and four-year college English departments and between two-year college departments and graduate departments preparing two-year college English instructors.